

REVIEW OF INTEGRATED LIBRARY SYSTEMS (RILS)

USER SURVEYS EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

February 2015

Rev. May 21, 2015

RILS Committee

Fredrick Allen

Alphie Garcia

Carla Hose

Luree Ohigashi-Oasay

Wayde Oshiro

Kathleen Stacey

Nackil Sung

Beth Tillinghast

Roberta Woods

INTRODUCTION

The Review of Integrated Library Systems (RILS) Coordinating Committee was established by the UH Library Council in 2014 to pursue a one-year study of the Consortium's current library systems and to report its findings. One of the primary charges given to the Committee was to determine whether these tools meet present needs. A main component of this study was to gather input on user satisfaction through system-wide surveys.

METHODOLOGY

A total of ten online surveys were developed by the Committee to measure user satisfaction with the Voyager ILS, Primo discovery layer, and SFX link resolver systems. The surveys were designed to measure satisfaction with the systems in terms of their functionality, use, and value. The various constituencies within the libraries were given an opportunity to provide feedback on the survey instruments as they were being developed.

Links to ten online surveys were presented to library staff across UH System Libraries via email announcement and survey links on the RILS wiki at <http://assist.hawaii.edu/wiki/rils/start>. Individuals were free to select the survey or surveys most relevant to their job duties and work experience. The survey period for the nine surveys targeting librarians and library staff was August 4-25, 2014. A tenth survey targeting general, non-library affiliated users, was made available October 13-24, 2014. A total of 90 responses were received for the nine surveys aimed at library staff. The public survey resulted in 154 student and faculty responses.

SURVEY FINDINGS FOR VOYAGER

This section discusses results from seven Voyager surveys:

- *Acquisitions Survey*
- *Cataloging Survey*
- *Circulation Survey*
- *Media Scheduling Survey*
- *Reporter Survey*
- *Systems Administration Survey*
- *Systems Office Staff Survey (All Modules)*

The 58 total responses to the six Voyager Module surveys and one All Modules survey are a representative snapshot of Voyager use across the UH System. The majority of responses were from librarians and staff with years of direct experience working with a variety of Voyager modules.

If a conclusion were to be reached, the responses indicate that most UH System Libraries staff are satisfied with the Voyager modules. While not an overwhelming show of enthusiasm exists, the comments indicate that the system is “adequate,” “the best option for now,” or “no worse than any other system out there.” There appears to be a feeling that migrating to a new system would be more trouble than remaining with Voyager, although the Committee did not ask the respondents to consider other systems. Much of the dissatisfaction expressed was for the Primo and SFX products, not for Voyager or the staff modules.

SURVEY FINDINGS FOR PRIMO

This section discusses results from the Primo-specific sections of the following surveys:

- *Acquisitions Survey*
- *Cataloging Survey*
- *Circulation Survey*
- *Primo Information Literacy User Survey*
- *Public Survey*
- *Reporter Survey*
- *SFX, Primo, and Hawaii Voyager - Non-teaching Survey*
- *System Administration Survey*

The *SFX, Primo and Hawaii Voyager - Non-teaching Survey* targeted librarians and library staff who interact with the front end of these systems. The *Primo Information Literacy User Survey* targeted instructional librarians who teach patrons to use library systems such as *Primo, SFX, and Voyager*. The *Acquisitions, Cataloging, Circulation, Media Scheduling, Reporter and System Administration Surveys* were aimed at librarians and staff who regularly work with these modules. The *Public Survey* targeted general users (UH students, faculty, and the general public) not employed by the libraries.

Respondents to the *SFX, Primo, and Hawaii Voyager Survey* were generally satisfied with Primo's functionality and its ability to search through most of the resources at their libraries. They see it as a useful research tool for some users. Though not perfect, they consider it to be a necessary tool for the UH System Libraries to retain in order to keep pace with current academic library trends. A common perception is that it is still premature to fully evaluate Primo's capabilities and more time is needed to develop it. By a large margin, respondents to this survey are not in favor of migrating to a new system.

In regards to the *Primo Information Literacy User Survey*, a majority of librarians teaching students and others how to perform research using online search tools and resources expressed clear dissatisfaction with Primo. They cited examples of important resources that are inadequately integrated or absent, limiting Primo as an all-in-one discovery tool. Other issues include poor relevancy rankings, inconsistent and unreliable results, a confusing interface for inexperienced users, and the lack of options to refine searches.

A majority of instructional librarians surveyed do not introduce Primo during library sessions often citing time constraints and the need to introduce subject-specific databases to students. Primo is not their first choice in teaching or in reference. Librarians were less decisive when it came to judging the adequacy of the current system for future needs, but over one-third said that it was not adequate and nearly half were unsure. An improved user interface, better search reliability, and integration of important databases is necessary before more instructional librarians will use Primo in their teaching.

With regards to the combined response from the *Acquisitions, Cataloging, Circulation, Reporter, Media Scheduling, and System Administration Voyager Module Surveys*, respondents were generally dissatisfied with Primo as a discovery tool. On the other hand, respondents to the *Public Survey* gave a very different picture of Primo. They appear to be quite satisfied with this product. This was true for non-library affiliated respondents at all levels of experience.

Though there is criticism with certain aspects of its functionality the majority of librarians and staff recognize the need to provide a discovery layer to patrons. Generally, more librarians and staff prefer to remain with this product than to abandon its use. One commonly-voiced viewpoint is that it may be too premature to fully evaluate Primo considering its controversial selection process that ultimately stymied its implementation. Additional support for remaining with Primo comes from the public opinion of Primo users - students and non-library faculty - where there is a high level of product satisfaction. Based on the combined results of these surveys the Committee recommends that the UH System Libraries remain with the Primo product.

Since a large percentage of librarians who regularly instruct using Primo are satisfied with the product, the Committee encourages those librarians responsible for information literacy instruction to continue their exploration of its use in teaching and to provide ongoing feedback to relevant committees and groups in the UH System Libraries. The Committee recommends that the Information Literacy Committee establish a dialogue with the newly-formed Discovery Committee and that they work together to improve its functionality.

Lastly, the Committee recommends a continued effort by the Library Council and library staff across the UH System to explore ways to increase Primo functionality by investing additional resources into the back end configuration with the goal of increasing user satisfaction at all levels.

SURVEY FINDINGS FOR SFX

This section covers the SFX results gathered from the *SFX Survey*, *Public Survey*, and the remainder of the surveys combined where selective SFX questions were presented to UH Libraries System employees. The *SFX Survey* targeted SFX Administrators only; the *Public Survey*, the UH Libraries System library users such as faculty, students, and the general public; and the remainder of surveys with SFX related questions, the UH Libraries System librarians (specifically, non-SFX Administrators) and library staff.

Based on the SFX survey results, public users are overwhelmingly satisfied with SFX. Librarians and library staff using the front end of SFX are also relatively satisfied users and believe that SFX will adequately serve the Consortium into the future. The only ambiguous group is the SFX Administrators who use the back end of the link resolver. They are the sole group that is equally split regarding their overall satisfaction and equally split again over remaining or “maybe” remaining with SFX. The latter depends on whether a “better” system exists.

CONCLUSION

The Committee’s survey of users reveal overall satisfaction with the library systems with the exception of Primo. The Voyager ILS adequately meets library staff needs, and the system continues to receive vendor support. SFX users are generally satisfied with the system and its ability to support future needs. Dissatisfaction with Primo is widespread but it may be premature to consider a new product so soon after a difficult and time-consuming implementation. Respondents to the public survey expressed satisfaction with all library systems. The surveys, in the end, reveal that support among library staff for migrating to a new system is weak.